

# CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER AND EASTERN CHRONICLE.

TWO DOLLARS A YEAR,  
PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY P. SHELDON.....WILLIAM A. DREW, EDITOR.

TWO DOLLARS & FIFTY CTS.  
IF NOT PAID IN ADVANCE.

VOL VIII.]

## JUDICIAL.

### JUDGE DESASSURE'S DECREE.

[As the question has been considerably agitated of late, whether a person who denies the doctrine of future punishment, but believes in the existence of God, in our moral accountability to Him, in the Sacred Scriptures, and in the punishment of sin under the divine law in this world, be a competent witness in a Court of Justice? we have thought our readers might be interested in the following judicial opinion of His Honor Judge Desassure, of South Carolina. It is long, but will well repay the reader for the perusal of it. That the Judge is correct we can admit of little or no doubt.]

In Equity—Union District, August, 1827.

### CASE OF PARTITION.

Eli Fernandis & Sarah Hall, v. Wm. Henderson.

This was a case in which the complainants, daughters of the late Col. John Henderson, filed their bill for the partition of land of their late father, lying in Union District, to which they claimed a right, in common with their brother, William Henderson, the defendant in the suit, as joint heirs with him. The partition was resisted on the ground, that the father had made and duly executed his last will and testament, by which he had devised the land in question to his son Wm. Henderson.—To this it was replied, that the said last will was not duly executed so as to pass real estate.

Our law always required three subscribing & credible witnesses to a will, disposing of real estate, in order to give it effect. Two of the subscribing witnesses to the will in question, are admitted to be competent and credible, and have proved the will to have been duly executed. The third subscribing witness, Mr. Charles Jones, was objected to as incompetent, on the alleged ground, that his religious tenets do not furnish the sanctions for his telling the truth which the law requires, inasmuch as he does not believe in a future state of rewards and punishments, according to the deeds done in the body.

Witnesses were called who attested that these were the avowed principles and opinions of the witness objected to, as well at the time of signing the will, as at this time; but being aware how easily the opinions of men may be misapprehended, or their principles misrepresented, I offered Mr. Jones permission to state his own creed on this point, if he should be disposed to do so. He expressed perfect willingness, and stated (not on oath) that he believed in the being and attributes of God; that he believed in the government of the world and of the affairs of man, by the Supreme God: That he believed in Jesus Christ and in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament: That he believed God would punish the evil and reward the good actions of men; but that the whole of these rewards and punishments would take place in this world, and, in this state of existence, until the Justice of God be satisfied; and not at all in a future state of existence after the natural death of man.

Such being the universal rule, founded on the absolute necessity of things, men submit to it: but endeavor to guard against the abuses to which the passions and the vices and the follies of their fellow men may expose them. The rule of reason, is, that all men, in possession of their faculties, are to be admitted and believed as witnesses:—But caution suggests exceptions. A foolish or weak man may be admitted, but less credit will be given to his testimony, because of his imbecility. A bad man may be received to give evidence, but less reliance is placed on it, because of his disregard of virtue, and its sanctions. But a man, who is notoriously a violator of truth, will not be believed, even if he testifies the truth; and if that notoriety be established by a legal conviction of a violation of truth, in a court of justice, (technically called perjury,) he is entirely excluded from giving evidence, as totally unworthy of credit. These are some of the precautions used by legislators and Courts to guard against the abuses of human testimony. There are others also: Believing that men, acted upon by a strong bias, will too frequently depart from the truth; witnesses supposed to be under that bias, are excluded from giving testimony altogether. By the English rule, adopted by us, that supposed bias, which excludes, is founded on pecuniary interest. Whoever has the smallest pecuniary interest in a cause, cannot be a witness in that cause. On the other hand, the nearest relations and connexions except husband and wife, and the warmest friends may be witnesses for each other. The English rule is surely an imperfect one. Who does not know that thousands of honorable men would give true testimony, though they had thousands of pounds depending on that testimony? Who does not know that these very men, acting under the bias of strong family attachments, might be warped from the truth, without their even perceiving or suspecting their departure from it in favor of near and dear relations. Men are the greatest sophists, even when they are honestly beguiling their own minds under the influence of the passions. Some nations have excluded very near relations from giving testimony in favor of each other, from a dread of the influence of these domestic attachments. And no Judge of any experience in our country, but must have seen and lamented

committed on their persons, out of sight of other witnesses. Women, entertaining these opinions, might be exposed to lawless violations in private, without protection. Murders might be committed on other persons with impunity, in the presence of persons of this excluded and degraded caste: And above all, the exclusion of these persons from being witnesses, might be the commencement of a system of exclusions and distinctions of classes among the citizens, entirely at variance with our liberal institutions and our republican government.

These were the bane of the ancient republics, as well as of the modern republics of Italy, and engendered those hatreds and civil feuds which ruined them all.—They deeply injured the Swiss republics.

These evils ought to be avoided if possible; still, however, the law must govern and guide every Judge in his decisions.—If the rule of law has been solemnly settled, and excludes such witnesses, the Court is bound to exclude them; and should the evils of the exclusion be so great as to require a legislative remedy, that will undoubtedly be applied. The argumentum ab inconvenienti, is always best addressed to that body.

Let us then examine what the law is on this point. It is necessary, however, to go somewhat deeper into this question, than what appears on the surface—and to look into the foundations of evidence in human society.

It is clear that the object of all evidence is the attainment of truth; and human evidence is indispensable to the attainment of that end, because it is man who sees and observes the actions of man, and can testify of them. The business of life could not go on without it; and though wicked politicians have said that language was given to man to disguise his thoughts, sound legislators have judged more wisely, that credit to the testimony of man, is indispensable for the purposes of justice; however, it may be sometimes perverted by wickedness and self-interest, or abused by wickedness and folly. All nations have resorted to human testimony as the evidence of truth, and the most important questions of life and death, of liberty and property, have been made to depend upon it. The Sacred Scriptures, inspired by Him, who knew what was in the heart of man, have declared, that out of the mouths of two or three witnesses, judgment shall be rendered between men. Such evidence mingles in every transaction, in contracts, and in all our daily communications with our race. On a journey, we receive and follow the instructions of perfect strangers without hesitation, though we know not whether they are wise or foolish, good or bad. We even rely upon the veracity of our most deadly enemies, when they propose a truce or suspension of arms.

Such being the universal rule, founded on the absolute necessity of things, men submit to it: but endeavor to guard against the abuses to which the passions and the vices and the follies of their fellow men may expose them. The rule of reason, is, that all men, in possession of their faculties, are to be admitted and believed as witnesses:—But caution suggests exceptions. A foolish or weak man may be admitted, but less credit will be given to his testimony, because of his imbecility. A bad man may be received to give evidence, but less reliance is placed on it, because of his disregard of virtue, and its sanctions. But a man, who is notoriously a violator of truth, will not be believed, even if he testifies the truth; and if that notoriety be established by a legal conviction of a violation of truth, in a court of justice, (technically called perjury,) he is entirely excluded from giving evidence, as totally unworthy of credit. These are some of the precautions used by legislators and Courts to guard against the abuses of human testimony. There are others also:

Believing that men, acted upon by a strong bias, will too frequently depart from the truth; witnesses supposed to be under that bias, are excluded from giving testimony altogether. By the English rule, adopted by us, that supposed bias, which excludes, is founded on pecuniary interest. Whoever has the smallest pecuniary interest in a cause, cannot be a witness in that cause. On the other hand, the nearest relations and connexions except husband and wife, and the warmest friends may be witnesses for each other. The English rule is surely an imperfect one. Who does not know that thousands of honorable men would give true testimony, though they had thousands of pounds depending on that testimony? Who does not know that these very men, acting under the bias of strong family attachments, might be warped from the truth, without their even perceiving or suspecting their departure from it in favor of near and dear relations. Men are the greatest sophists, even when they are honestly beguiling their own minds under the influence of the passions. Some nations have excluded very near relations from giving testimony in favor of each other, from a dread of the influence of these domestic attachments. And no Judge of any experience in our country, but must have seen and lamented

the extent to which these attachments carry men in giving evidence; yet the exclusion of relations would often shut out all the means of obtaining the truth—they are the most likely to be the witnesses of the transactions of each other. Thus we perceive, that it is a most difficult subject to frame a rule perfectly adapted to its object. The consequence has been, that in modern times, the disposition of the courts of justice has been to narrow the ground of incompetency, and to leave the objections to operate on the credit of the witnesses, to be judged of from personal character, and from the intelligence and clearness of the testimony.

After saying who may and who may not be witnesses, legislators have provided what appeared to be the best means of securing the veracity of those who are admitted by the sanctions which were believed to have the most influence on the human mind. That which has generally been considered as the sanction of the highest nature, has been an appeal to the Deity, for the truth of what the witness testifies. This is evidently founded on the supposition that the witness believed in God, and that he is the avenger of falsehood.

The English law of evidence at one period required witnesses to be sworn on the Holy Evangelists or Christian Scriptures. And Lord Coke, certainly laid down the rule to be that an Infidel could not be a witness—Co Litt. 6 p. From this opinion, Lord Hale and the Judges of a later period differed, and pointed out its unsoundness. The subject, however, received the fullest illustration in the argument and decision in the great case of Omichund v. Barker. That cause was heard so late as the year 1744. Lord Chancellor Hardwicke was desirous to have the question of evidence solemnly settled, and obtained the assistance of Lord Chief Justice Lee, Lord Chief Justice Willes of the Common Pleas, and Lord Chief Baron Parker. It was argued before that able tribunal, by Sir Dudley Rider, and Mr. Murray, (both subsequently Chief Justices,) and by other eminent counsel. The Judges and the Councillor took time to consider and delivered their opinions *seriatim*. The Judgment of the Court was, that Gentoo's sworn according to their religious ceremonies, were competent witnesses, though they were not Christians, and acknowledged none of its peculiar doctrines. That case is best and most fully reported in 1 Atk. 21. It is also reported in Willes, 538. The latter is short and only valuable as giving Lord Chief Justice Willes' opinion more fully and accurately than it is reported by Atkins.—These Judges examined with great learning the opinion of Lord Coke, and refuted it triumphantly. It is unnecessary to follow the whole course of their arguments, but I think it proper to refer to particular passages of some of their opinions, as illustrating the question now before us.—The Lord Chancellor in his judgment, states, (p. 43. 1 Atk.) that his object was to be certain, whether these people, (Gentoo's,) believed in the being of a God and his providence? Being satisfied of that, he admitted them to be competent witnesses. He also states that Bishop Sanderson laid down the proper rule, *juris juramentum est affirmatio religiosa*—And all that was necessary to an oath, is an appeal to the Supreme Being, as thinking him the avenger of falsehood, and the rewarder of truth.—This, Lord Hardwicke adds, is not contradicted by a single writer, known to him but Lord Coke. In the report of Lord Chief Justice Willes' judgment, as stated in his own notes, there are some particulars which it is proper to notice. He refutes the narrow notion of Lord Coke, that an infidel, or person who did not believe in the Christian religion could not be received as a witness; and states that, (even according to Lord Coke,) *Juramen tum nihil aliud est quam Deum in testem vocare*; and, therefore, nothing but a belief of a God, and that he will reward and punish us according to our deserts, is necessary to qualify a man to take an oath. He then says (p. 546) the nature of an oath was not at all altered by the dispensation of the New Testament, only as the promise of rewards and punishments in another world was then more clearly revealed—the obligation of an oath became much stronger. In p. 549, he says, that such infidels, (if any such there be,) who do not believe in a God, or if they do, do not think he will punish them in this world, or the next, cannot be witnesses, because an oath cannot be any tie or obligation on them. In p. 550, he says, that if an infidel, who believes a God, or that he will reward and punish him in this world, but does not believe in a future state, be examined on oath, (as he thought he might,) yet he would not be entitled to the same degree of credit as a Christian witness who believed that he should be punished in another world as well as in this, if he did not state the truth.

Notwithstanding this great decision, the question has been since made at different times.

Starkie in his excellent treatise on evidence, lays it down, that, before a witness is sworn, he may be asked whether

he believes in the existence of a God, in the obligation of an oath, and in a future state of rewards and punishments; and if he does not he cannot be admitted to give evidence; for which he cites Peake's N. Pr. Rep. 11. He does not, however, distinguish whether the state of future rewards and punishments is to be in this world or the next; or in both: In the ordinary use of the word it means in another world. In the case of Jackson vs. Gridley, N. York Rep. 18 p. 98, it was decided by Chief Justice Spencer, (who delivered the opinion of the whole court,) that a person who does not believe in the existence of a God, nor in a future state of rewards and punishments, cannot be a witness in a court of justice. In delivering this judgment, Chief Justice Spencer states the established rule to be, that infidels who do not believe in a God, or if they do, do not think he will either reward or punish them in the world to come, cannot be witnesses in any case, because an oath cannot possibly be any tie or obligation on them. And he quotes Willes' Rep. as well as Atkins. He says that the New York Legislature have enacted a statute to the same effect. With great deference to that eminent Jurist, Chief Justice Spencer, I think that he has laid down the rule more broadly than the decision actually made in the case which he quotes. And we have seen that Chief Justice Willes expressly states his opinion to be, that a person who believes in a God, and rewards and punishments in this life, is a competent witness, though not entitled to so much credit as a witness who contradicts him and believes in rewards and punishments in the world to come, as well as in this world. And Lord Chan. Hardwicke expressly says (p. 48 of Atkins)—

"My intention was to be certified whether these people believed in God and his providence." And lower down he agrees with Bishop Sanderson, "that all that is necessary to an oath is an appeal to the Supreme Being as the rewarder of truth and avenger of falsehood."

In the case before Chief Justice Spencer, the person offered as a witness disbelieved the belief in a God altogether, and believed that man perished altogether like beasts.—Since examining the case of Jackson vs. Gridley, 18th Johnson, I am indebted to Mr. McCord, a learned counsellor of our bar, for pointing out to me some decisions reported in 2d Cowen's Rep. N. York, on this question. In the case of Butts vs. Swartout, 2d Cowen, 431, it was decided, that one who believes in the existence of a God is a competent witness. The marginal note goes further. But the opinions expressed by the person offered as a witness, sworn to by another witness, were "that he believed in the Deity, and in the doctrine of universal salvation." He was admitted to be sworn. In a note to this case, it is stated that there are many persons in the state of New York who deny any future punishment of the wicked after this life, and that the question as to their admissibility as witnesses has been frequently agitated but never distinctly brought before the Supreme Court. In one case before the Circuit Court, the People vs. Matteson, Judge Walworth delivered the judgment of the Court. It decided that the belief of rewards and punishments in this life is sufficient to admit a witness to be sworn. In a clear review of the subject, the Judge shews that the elementary writers have all been misled by Atkins, who in his report of Omichund vs. Barker, ascribes to Chief Justice Willes, an opinion which he did not entertain, as appears by his own report of what his real opinion was. This error arose from the confidence reposed in the accuracy of Atkins, whose error was never corrected until the publication of Willes' Reports, 50 yrs. after. He also cites a case from 15th Mass. Rep. 184, wherein it was decided, that the infidelity of a witness as to a future state of existence, goes to his credibility, and not to his competency. In short, that wherever you have a tie on the conscience, the witness is admissible.

In a note in 2d Cowen, p. 572, 3, 4, Judge Williams delivers a clear opinion, "that it is not necessary in order to render a man a competent witness, that he should believe anything more than that there is a Supreme Being, and that he will reward and punish either in this or another life."

In our own state, in the case of the State vs. Petty, two of the Judges (Colcock and Richardson,) were of opinion that a man "who did not believe in a future state of rewards and punishments, could not be a witness," which I understand had reference to a future state of existence. Judges Johnson, Nott and Huger, reserved their opinions: 1 Harper's State Rep. p. 59. I owe and feel great deference for the judgments of the courts of our own state. *Stare decisis* is a maxim of wisdom and of peace. If this had been the judgment of the court, I should have felt bound by it, however my private opinion might be different. It is evidently, however, not the judgment of the court, but the opinion of two judges, which are entitled to great respect, but does not establish the law.

I have considered this question much and anxiously, and I acknowledge that I have come to a different conclusion, with an entire conviction of my judgment. The object of testimony is the attainment of truth. It is the apprehension of obtaining falsehood instead of truth, which has induced human tribunals to require the highest sanction which can be obtained. An appeal to the God of truth, in the manner deemed the most sacred and obligatory on his conscience, by the person offered as a witness, has been universally held to be the highest sanction. Jews and Gentiles, Europeans and Asiatics, Ancients and Moderns, have resorted to and

relied on this as test of truth; the highest discovered by human wisdom.

In the case before us, the person offered as a witness, believes in a Supreme Being, a God, who is the ruler of the universe, and who is the avenger of falsehood. But in his creed, *that vengeance is poured out on the forsaken witness in this life, and not in another state of being.* He believes the impious wretch can neither escape detection from the eye of Omnipotence, nor punishment from Omnipotence.

It does appear to me that this is a sufficient sanction to guarantee the attainment of truth from a witness. It is said by very learned men that the Mosaic dispensation did not look beyond rewards and punishments in this life. And even in our Saviour's time, the Sadducees did not believe in a future state. Yet oaths were required abundantly under that system, as well as under all the heathen systems. Yet St. Paul says expressly, that life and immortality were brought to light by our Saviour, and surely the doubts of the great Philosophers during the brilliant periods of Greece and Rome, shew the necessity of such a revelation. There is yet another sanction derived from human laws. Every witness knows that he gives evidence, under penalties provided by human laws to punish wilful falsehood in testimony. I would not, however, press this argument, because it might lead too far, and admit even those who deny wholly the existence of a God or Providence, or punishments in this or another world.

What has made a great impression on my mind, is, that the objection is of vast extent the limits of which I cannot perceive. It might exclude all those from being witnesses, who do not believe in the eternity of punishments. It may exclude Roman Catholics, who believe that punishments in another world, may be avoided altogether by absolution, or diminished by masses and prayers. In short, I know not where the objection would stop in its operation, and it would be more mischievous in this country than in any other, because the unbounded liberty of conscience enjoyed by our citizens, leads to many aberrations from the standard of belief others think correct. The business of the court is not with opinions. The only question is whether there is reasonable ground to believe that we have such a tie on the conscience of the person offered as witness, as may ensure his telling the truth. I think we have, in the case, I am considering, and feel bound to admit the witness as competent.

There is, however, another ground on which it is my duty to express an opinion. It was contended for the defendant, that the witness was entitled to be sworn, because the constitution of this state guarantees liberty of conscience, which would be violated by excluding citizens from being witnesses, on account of their religious opinions. The 1st Sect. of the 8th Art. of the constitution, is that relied on. That section provides, that the free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship without discrimination or preference, shall forever hereafter be allowed within this state to all mankind.—Provided, that the liberty of conscience thereby declared shall not be so constructed, as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of this state.

On the argument of the cause, it was contended by the counsel who opposed the admission of Mr. Jones as a competent witness, that the inquiry into his religious opinions, did not contravene this article of the constitution. That he might still enjoy his religious profession and worship, notwithstanding such exclusion; and that the exclusion would merely operate on his civil and not on his religious rights. I have considered this subject with attention, and I am not satisfied with this argument. If a man's religious opinions are made a ground to exclude him from the enjoyment of civil rights, then he does not enjoy the freedom of his religious profession and worship. His exclusion from being a witness in courts of justice, is a serious injury to him. It is also degrading to him and others who think with him. If men may be excluded for their religious opinions from being witnesses, they may be excluded from being jurors or judges. And the legislature might enact a law excluding such persons from holding any other office or serving in the legislature, or becoming teachers of schools, or professors of colleges. In my judgment this would be in the very teeth of the constitution and would violate the spirit of all our institutions.

I do not know in what that state of things would differ from the galling restraints of the Irish Roman Catholics, which have so long kept that beautiful country, and that high spirited people, in a state of degradation and misery, and of discontent and rebellion. It would seem to me to be a mockery to say to men, you may enjoy the freedom of your religious professions and worship, but if you differ from us in certain dogmas and points of belief, you shall be disqualified and deprived of the rights of a citizen, to which you would be entitled but for those differences of religious opinion.

The provision in the 1st Sect. of the 8th Art. of the constitution, states the sole limitation to the freedom of religious profession and worship. The restriction is upon acts and practices, and not upon opinions. Now the belief of Mr. Jones, who is objected to as a witness, that there will not be rewards and punishments in another state of being, for acts done in this world, is neither an act nor a practice; it is merely an opinion; a religious profession. He does believe in the punishment of evil deeds, but it is in this world, under the superintending Providence of the Omnipotent God, who can never be deceived as to the import of human actions, or their motives. This, I think, gives a sufficient tie on his conscience.

I am aware that there is great force in the remarks of C. Justice Spencer, in the last paragraph of the judgment of the Court in New-York, in the case of Jackson vs. Gridley, 18th Johnson, 106. It amounts, however,

only to this: That though every man has a right to indulge in his religious opinions, which is a concern between his conscience and his God, the tribunals have a right to interfere in the ascertainment of truth—and that these are bound to see that no man's rights are impaired but through the medium of testimony entitled to credit, and no testimony is entitled to belief unless delivered under the sanction of an oath, which comes home to the conscience of the witness and creates a tie arising from this belief, that false swearing would expose him to punishment in the life to come. On this the learned Judge states rests all our institutions, and especially the administration of justice. The real question, however, is, whether the belief of God and his Providence, and that he is the avenger of falsehood, though the vengeance is confined to punishment in this world, does not give this tie, this hold on the conscience which is sought for? In my judgment it does, so far at least to impose on the court an obligation to forbear its interference with the civil rights of the man, which would be violated by excluding him from being a witness. It will be time enough to consider and decide when the case arises, whether a man who is offered as a witness, should be rejected because of his disbelief in God, in Providence, and in any rewards and punishments in this world, or in the world to come. In such a case there could be no tie or hold on the conscience, for there could be no conscience.—When such an unhappy case arises, it will be most solemnly considered. Upon the whole, I am of opinion, that on principle, as well as on the provision of the constitution, Mr. Jones is a competent witness, and the party interested in the will of Mr. John Henderson, is entitled to the benefit of his testimony.

HENRY W. DESASSURE.

### THE INTELLIGENCER.

SPEAKING THE TRUTH IN LOVE.....PAUL.  
GARDINER, FRIDAY, JAN. 25.

**SCHOOL DISCIPLINE.** We suppose that an instructor of youth has, for the time being, the same authority over his pupils, and, so far as may be necessary for purposes of instruction, the same right to make requirements and to chastise in cases of disobedience, that a parent has over his children.—The parent who puts his child under the care of an instructor, does thereby convey to the latter a portion of that authority which he himself possesses; and the former is liable only for the *abuses* of that authority.

If this principle be correct,—and we think it cannot be disputed,—it follows that a teacher has a right to inflict such punishment on his scholars for a disobedience to his orders as he may deem salutary and expedient; nor, on account of such chastisements, can the parent complain, unless they are obviously unjust or disproportionate.—There is an opinion somewhat prevalent in the community, that an instructor has no right to inflict corporal punishment upon a child committed to his charge—an opinion which has been the cause of no little mischief, but it is one which is manifestly erroneous as has often been decided in the Courts where it has brought the parties concerned. A teacher must have some government—some system of discipline, or it will be impossible for him to perform the duties of his office; but to deny him the right of executing that government—of putting that system into operation, is to deprive him of the power of fulfilling the primary obligations which devolve upon him as an instructor.

But it ought never to be lost sight of, that the powers which a tutor derives from a parent over his children, are of that kind, and of that kind only, which the parent himself possesses;—that is, they are purely *parental*. The children, while under his charge, are, as it were, *his*, and he stands to them in the relation of a father—certainly not in that of a tyrant. He has no right to be cruel, arbitrary or capricious. His government must be laid in parental principles, or he becomes an usurper and forfeits all authority over his pupils. He has no right to institute any government over his scholars, that are inconsistent with what a wise and indulgent parent would adopt in the government of his family. His authority and rule of duty begin and end in that of the parent; and while he has the right to exercise a *parental* discipline, he has no right to exercise any other.

Let teachers then remember the solemn and interesting relation in which they stand to their pupils, and in no case demean themselves unworthy of that relationship.

**EXPERIENCING RELIGION.** "Did you ever experience religion?" said Mrs. Peabody to Mr. Howard the other day, as she accosted him abruptly in the street. "Did I ever experience religion? yes, madam," replied Mr. H. "I have experienced religion a great many times." But a person can never experience religion but once, and it is a humiliating confession to say you think you have experienced it many times, as such a statement shows that you must often have been a backslider. "Perhaps you do not rightly understand me," rejoined Mr. H.—"I look beyond sounds to things, and when a person proposes a question to me in any intelligible form of words, I endeavor to answer it according to the true import and meaning of the language in which it is communicated. You ask me if I ever experienced religion? Religion is goodness. This I am happy to say

I have frequently experienced in my intercourse through a long life with my friends, my neighbors and my fellow creatures generally. I have experienced their kind offices, their friendships and their generous assistance—in short, I have experienced their religion—their goodness as often as I have stood in need of the evidences of their piety. Nor do I consider it disgraceful to me or to others, that I am able to say I have many times experienced the benefits of religion from my neighbors."

But this is not such an answer as I wanted, replied Mrs. P. evidently out of humor. I want to know,—to express myself more plainly,—if you profess to be an experienced man in religion? "Why as regards this question, Mrs. P. modesty in me would dictate silence; but as you appear very anxious to know what does not particularly concern you, I will say, I think I may affirm, that I am an experienced man. Before you was in your cradle, madam, I studied the sacred scriptures with deep and solemn interest, and for fifty years at least have sincerely endeavored to conform to the rules of faith and practice therein prescribed. Experience, I assure you, is a work of time; and those only are experienced in religion who for years have practised upon its holy and purifying principles. An experienced farmer is one who has long been engaged in agricultural pursuits. An experienced merchant is one who for years has devoted his attention to trade. An experienced artisan is one who is thoroughly and practically versed in mechanical science. And an experienced christian is not one who goes from a merry company to an evening meeting and returns, in the course of an hour or two, half distracted with a fear of hell, but one who has made a steady and profitable advance in the road of duty,—one who understands religion and has long practised its salutary precepts. I think I can say I am somewhat of "an experienced man"—certainly more experienced than yourself who was converted only three weeks ago, and have since afforded no great evidence, beyond that which consists in words, of possessing the genuine religion of Christ."

Ab, exclaimed Mrs. P. I see you do not understand me, and it is no use for you to say any thing farther upon the subject.—"Then learn to make yourself intelligible. Leave off your unmeaning cant and employ a language which expresses what you mean, and you may meet with better success in your officious interrogatories, and, withal, obtain for yourself more correct ideas of religion and those who possess it than you now seem to have."

**DR. ADAM.** We saw it stated in the Waterville Intelligencer of week before last, that the Rev. Dr. Adam is now engaged in publishing a *Sunday paper* in Calcutta. We cannot think but that this statement is made for dishonorable if not malicious purposes.—Dr. Adam is not, nor was he ever an editor of a Sunday paper. The facts are that he was applied to to edit a daily paper we believe already in existence, which was published also on the Sabbath. He, in reply, declined having any thing to do with the paper unless its publication should thereafter be suspended on the Sabbath; and this probably is what gave rise to the false report that he edits a Sunday paper. It does seem as if some religionists were willing to stick at no means which can serve to vilify their opponents.

Rev. Thomas Whitemore of Cambridge, (Mass.) has been invited to the pastoral care of the First Universalist Society in Cincinnati, Ohio.

**NEW MEETING HOUSE.** We learn that the Universalist Society in Livermore, (Me.) contemplate erecting a new and elegant house of worship in that town the ensuing season.

### ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS.

#### FOR THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

##### A DISCOURSE

Delivered before the FEMALE SAMARITAN SOCIETY, of Boston, on the Eve of the First Sabbath in November, 1827; by REV. R. STREETER, of Watertown.

Verily I say unto you, Wheresoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, there shall this, that this woman hath done, be told for a memorial of her. MATT. xxvi. 13.

[Concluded from our last.]

But do any suspect that we have indulged in the dreams of fancy or the flights of imagination? Are these things too good to be admitted without *ocular* demonstration? Then, let us attend to an unvarnished statement of facts, from the Treasurer's book. It reads thus:—"During the year past we have received of money into the Treasury, \$357 24, and have paid out \$347 73; leaving a balance of \$9 51.

"The donations have been \$18 25, and various other articles for the use of the society. Remaining in the Treasury, 166 garments, and sundry others not made up.

"Have visited 247 families; distributed

And what say you now? Did we attempt to deceive the mental eye with fanciful and rhetorical fictions? No; so far from it, *the half had not been told*; Facts speak louder than words. In the statement I have been permitted to announce publicly, you have the evidence of numerical demonstration. No one can fail to discover that even with limited means, those "daughters of pity" have done wonders for suffering fellow-beings. They have done much towards sustaining those infants whose inheritance was poverty and sickness; have supplied the unfortunate in youth and middle age, with food or raiment or medicine or conveniences, as was most expedient; "and, following the weary pilgrims, scarred with afflictions, crippled with infirmities and crushed by the weight of years to "the gates of the grave," have presented the sweetest cordial to their dying lips. Yes, and whilst suffering and sickness, fleeing before those heroines of mercy, evince the necessity of patience and perseverance in this hallowed undertaking, the glow of health and the shouts of gratitude which follow their footsteps, suggest to us all, the munificence with which we should contribute to accelerate their march, extend their influence and secure to them a charitable triumph.

Merciful God! accept our earnest thanks that we are privileged to participate in a work so humane, so divine; and may we be actuated by the wisdom from above—"which is easy to be intreated—full of mercy and good fruits." Then shall we assist in throwing charity's robe around many a child of sorrow.

O celestial Charity! how soft are thy bonds of moral obligation—how piteous the errand on which thy messengers are sent? How arduous and yet how welcome the task of having the guardianship of the helpless, with the means of contributing to their welfare? How it makes the heart overflow with gladness to witness the united zeal and energy of many benevolent minds and hearts and hands. And how great will be the reward, when these donations shall have been faithfully appropriated by Charity's stewards, and enjoyed by grateful recipients! "Well done good and faithful servants; enter ye into the joy of your Lord."

But will any scrupulously inquire,—"how a Female Society can become so extensively useful, and do so much good?"—In answer, it need only be suggested that their combined wisdom, benevolence, industry, and patience may, with admirable facility, be applied to charitable objects and the mitigation of human suffering.—Who are first acquainted with the peculiar circumstances of those in community, whose means of subsistence are most scanty and limited? Who would first learn the degree of a widow's poverty & the wretchedness of her "little ones?" Whose ear first heard the sigh—the groan, from yonder dwelling, when the virtuous mother reclined on the fevered couch, without a nurse to watch by her pillow or a friend to take charge of her family? And who knew best where charity is required, and what food, or raiment, or medical aid, or preparation for a funeral hour, is needed? Tell me, ye friends of humanity, who retain the robeless corpse from the grave, till the white shroud is prepared, in which kindred clay is committed to the empire of death, to mingle with the nations of the dead?—Is not the answer responded from every quarter? "They are women! women of Samaritan benevolence."

Yes, theirs is the first knowledge of such instances of suffering, and theirs the dearest offices of human kindness; and, as husbands, fathers and rational men, we will rejoice that the Creative Mind saw fit to endow them with hearts and faculties and sympathies, admirably adapted to the holier duties of charity. Whilst men are employed in the more arduous and bold enterprises of life, let women remain in the possession of their proper rights and milder dignity, and, as opportunity may present, devise and execute schemes of mercy, for which, by a felicity of constitution, they are well qualified. Let us rejoice in the fullness of gratified love that, by means of this Society, the fatherless have oft been blest, and the widows' hearts been tuned to joy: That hunger has been quelled—sickness shorn of its severity—and the most barbed arrows plucked from the quiver of death: That the administration of female wisdom and valor, has not only resulted in the relief of the afflicted and the consolation of the dying, but has invaded the dominion of the destroying angel, throwing her death robes around some of his unclad prisoners!

But, hark! what shriek of anguish do I hear? Oh, is it possible! There is a dying mother—a widow; around her bedside are crowding her lovely children; to whom no legacy is left but the record of a father's love and the recollection of a mother's tenderness and care. To leave them in the wide world, unprotected, unprovided—for the thoughts, Oh, how dreadful! Her eyes quiver with horror as she reels and stumbles on the threshold of the tomb.—But, dying mother, be comforted: Thou believest in God; believe also in the mercy of his providences. Knowest thou not that a system of benevolence is in operation, under the direction of the "FEMALE SAMARITAN SOCIETY" in this place, by which provision will be made for thine orphan family, as soon as their condition is known. "Ah, but how are the funds of this charitable Society to be replenished?" whispers the sinking widow. Thou child of mortality! be not faithless. Why, this heart bounds for joy, when I inform you,

that some liberal donations are tendered by individuals—annual contributions are made by generous assemblies, and—But, enough; she smiles—her eyes are composed, her heart is at rest; and, resigning her cherub boys and angel daughters into hands, which, under God, are worthy of being trusted with these donations and contributions for the poor, the sick, the fatherless and widows—she dies, with a hope full of immortality; saying,

"Vital spark of heavenly flame,  
Quit, O quit this mortal frame;  
Trembling, hoping—ling'ring, flying,  
O the pain, the bliss of dying!  
Cease fond nature, cease thy strife,  
And let me languish into life."

[The following letter and those that are to follow it, are written by a respectable citizen of this State to his son, W. H. D. Esq. residing in Mississippi.]

#### FOR THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

##### LETTER, NO. I.

My Dear Son:

I was rejoiced to receive a letter from you informing me that you had established and superintended a Sabbath School in your town the last season. I suppose it must be something new in Mississippi, as I have not heard of one being established so far south before.

There appear to be three points necessary to be taught in the Sunday Schools: first, the evidence of the truth of revealed religion; secondly, the truths which this religion reveals, and third, its utility and advantages. I shall not be very particular in relating what has amounted to evidence, in my mind, of the truth of revealed religion. It hardly seems probable, that a Being of infinite wisdom, would make a world and create accountable beings with moral capacities to inhabit it, where one course would produce happiness and the other misery, without giving them some guide, some light, whereby they might direct their steps. We may as well be Atheists at once, as to suppose there is a Being who has made man and cares nothing about him, is perfectly indifferent as to his happiness or misery, refuses or neglects to guide him in the course which he ought to pursue. It may be said that he has written his law on man's heart, given him a moral sense, a conscience, approving or condemning his actions;—admitted, and well is it for those who obey and cherish its divine instructions. But has this fact any reason, or evidence in it, that this Being should not see fit to inspire certain men to communicate his will to us, set before us a right example for our imitation, and inspire us to a greater ardor for virtue, holiness and truth? I see nothing improbable in this, nothing irrational in it. He gave us reason and understanding—why not give us something to reason upon and understand?

To bestow a faculty, for which there was no use, would look like labor spent in vain. My understanding leads me to conclude, that the Being who made man has some regard for him, wishes for his happiness, and has planned measures to secure it. If it is admitted that the scriptures of the old and new Testaments are the word of God, communicated to us by such agents as he saw fit to appoint, the questions for us to determine are, what do they teach? what doth the Lord our God require of us? why and for what purpose he has made us? how shall we understand his will and our duty? Such questions seem naturally to arise in the minds of an intelligent, reflecting, calculating being, making rational use of the faculties which his Creator has given him.

In the first place we are informed by the scriptures that God made the heavens and the earth; well, if He did not make them who did? who else has either the power or the wisdom requisite to plan and execute so stupendous a machinery as the term of twenty-four hours, in a cloudless sky, presents to our view? Among the various animals which he saw fit to dwell on this globe, he made one which he called a human being—man. We are also informed that this being, man, disobeyed a command of his Creator, by eating some fruit which he was forbidden to eat, and he was seasonably told, that a certain penalty was annexed to the violation of that command; which was, "in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." He disobeyed this command, did eat, and suffered the consequences of his transgression. If it is admitted that the scriptures of the old and new Testaments are the word of God, communicated to us by such agents as he saw fit to appoint, the questions for us to determine are, what do they teach? what doth the Lord our God require of us? why and for what purpose he has made us? how shall we understand his will and our duty? Such questions seem naturally to arise in the minds of an intelligent, reflecting, calculating being, making rational use of the faculties which his Creator has given him.

In the first place we are informed by the scriptures that God made the heavens and the earth; well, if He did not make them who did? who else has either the power or the wisdom requisite to plan and execute so stupendous a machinery as the term of twenty-four hours, in a cloudless sky, presents to our view? Among the various animals which he saw fit to dwell on this globe, he made one which he called a human being—man. We are also informed that this being, man, disobeyed a command of his Creator, by eating some fruit which he was forbidden to eat, and he was seasonably told, that a certain penalty was annexed to the violation of that command; which was, "in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." He disobeyed this command, did eat, and suffered the consequences of his transgression. The effect of this transgression upon his posterity, (and all the Christian world, at least, suppose themselves his descendants,) has occupied the minds of thousands and thousands of our species, and books have been written and discourses delivered almost without number on the subject. The most prevalent opinion is that which was condensed from notions of St. Augustine, St. Athanasius and John Calvin, by the Westminster Assembly of Divines in England about two hundred years ago. They call the transaction "The Fall," and say that "the fall brought all mankind into a state of sin and misery." "All mankind by the fall lost communion with God, are under his wrath and curse, and so made liable to all the miseries of this life, to death itself, and the pains of hell forever." This is generally the doctrine on which what are called orthodox theologians at the present day, build their system; and it rings from their pulpits with as many permutations and combinations as their fancies can invent, or their imaginations conceive. The main objection I have to it is, that it is not true; but I

must defer giving my reasons and arguments against it until my next. You will however perceive, at the first glance, that it involves the doctrine of total depravity which some Calvinists begin, secretly, to blush to own. One of their preachers, Dr. Beecher, has lately in a note appended to one of his printed sermons, denied that he ever preached it, so far as to include infant damnation; asserts that he never heard any other person preach it, nor had he read any such doctrine in any Calvinistic book, although he had been conversant with their books for more than thirty years. With how much regard to *truth* this assertion was made, the public must judge; but it places beyond a doubt the fact, that they start and tremble at the blasphemy of the doctrine—a doctrine which at once robs the God of the universe of justice, of goodness and of love—a doctrine involving more cruelty than any other ever thought of, by a Scythian, a Tartar or a Turk—a doctrine which I am persuaded you do not believe, and never teach in your school. True religion begins and ends in the love of God and of our neighbor. If children are early taught the truly admirable and infinitely benevolent attributes of their heavenly Father, they cannot fail to love and worship him. If they love him, they will never willingly offend him. They will strive to live the life he requires of his laws. Knowing his omnipresence they will pray to him in language like the following—"Cleanse us O Lord from secret faults, keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins, let them not have dominion over us; may the words of our mouths and the meditations of our hearts be ever acceptable in thy sight, O God our strength and our Redeemer."

Accept my best affections. D.

#### FOR THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

##### SHORT SERMONS. NO. 15.

But there is a spirit in man; and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding.—Job xxvii. 8.

To God we are indebted for all the powers and faculties which we possess; whether of body or of mind. Our reason, judgment and memory are so many faculties bestowed by the Almighty hand, and that He might have added others to those we now possess had it been conducive to our happiness, cannot be the subject of a moment's doubt to the unprejudiced mind. But there are prejudices, and we hardly know how to account for them, against the belief in the gift of prophecy, and even attempts have been made to reconcile this disbelief with the scriptures, and make out that those who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit, were not endowed with any new faculty, did not possess any extraordinary gift from heaven, but were only moved by those impulses, which all men feel in common. But if we admit that it is possible for God to bestow new powers upon the human mind, in addition to those which it now possesses, is it not also probable that if circumstances rendered the gift of this new power necessary, God would bestow it? The ability to foresee and foretell future events, is not more wonderful, if properly considered, than the ability to look back and tell of events that are already past. The power which we call memory, is every whit as wonderful as the faculty of prophecy. By the help of memory we can look back upon hours, days and years, and distinctly recall events to mind which then transpired, but how we do it we know not; we can only say that we are indebted to the Giver of all good for the ability to do it, and why he has not given a like ability to look into the events of futurity, can only be accounted for on the supposition that it would not be conducive to our happiness. A knowledge of future events could be of little use; and for ought we knew, so far from producing happiness, it might be a source of unceasing misery. How much the prophets suffered from a view of the miseries in futurity for the Jewish nation—how much might we suffer from a constant view of the days of evil, which God has graciously hid from our knowledge. But memory seems essential to our very existence, and is a faculty which we know not how to dispense with. It is, we allow, in some instances, productive of evil; but the general good which results from it more than overbalances it.

It is no argument against the gift of prophecy, that it is not possessed in common, or at the present day by any; there are various abilities which are not possessed in common; the inspiration of the Almighty which giveth man understanding, having bestowed upon one a superior capacity for one thing, and upon another for something different, as the wants of society have required. And with respect to its not being possessed at the present day by any, we may say that it does not appear to be necessary, the ordinary operations of Providence being sufficient to accomplish now what the infancy of the church required to be accomplished by means that were out of the ordinary course of Providence. A deaf or a blind man might argue against a belief in hearing or seeing, because they were strangers to these faculties, and assert with as much reason that it is impossible or improbable that God should bestow them upon others because they did not possess them, as we should were we to assert that it was improbable or impossible for God to bestow the faculty of foreseeing future events, did the state of society require this extraordinary manifestation of power from God.

J. W. H.

## EASTERN CHRONICLE.

### THE CHRONICLE.

"AND CATCH THE MANNERS LIVING AS THEY RISE."

GARDINER, FRIDAY, JAN. 25, 1828.

**MAINE LEGISLATURE.** On Friday last the subject of appropriations for the erection of State House, &c. was taken up in the Senate, and debated through the principal part of that and the following day. Various amendments were proposed, some of which prevailed, not however materially affecting the general character of the resolve reported by the Committee. On Wednesday last the resolve was again taken up for consideration; but we had no advise of the proceedings of the Senate upon it, when our paper went to press.

Propositions to abolish capital punishments and imprisonment for debt, have been made in the Legislature, but what disposition will finally be made of them remains yet to be determined. On the subject of capital punishments we feel disposed here to propose two or three inquiries. Has any person, as an individual, in the state, a right to kill, or take the life of, another citizen? If not—if every individual in the state is a 0, suppose all the citizens of Maine were assembled together, would their being brought together create a unit out of so many cyphers? How then have the representatives of the people a power to enact laws that would take the life of an individual, if the people, in their primary capacities, have not that power to give them? Has the Legislature a right to do what all the people of a state have not the right to do?

**PRESIDENTIAL.** The Convention of delegates from every county in Virginia met in Richmond on the 8th inst., and held a session of a number of days. The Richmond Inquirer says it was the most able and venerable convention that ever assembled in that state. A list of electors, opposed to Gen. Jackson, consisting of 26 gentlemen, was nominated, headed by the names of the late Presidents Madison and Monroe. The convention nominated John Q. Adams for President and Richard Rush for Vice President.

A writer in the Richmond Inquirer recommends Chief Justice Marshall for the Presidency. Another writer nominates Chapman Johnson of Virginia, as Vice President. The candidates for Vice President are "as thick as blackberries."

A friend informs us that Mr. Rogers of Farmington did read the Governor's late Proclamation for Thanksgiving. We are sorry if we have done that gentleman injustice—but truly we did not state what we did two or three weeks ago, without having what we could not but believe to be good authority for so doing. We cannot think that our first informant would intentionally have deceived us as to the fact.

A new Post Office is established at the lower village in Waterford, Oxford County, called "South Waterford Post Office," and Nath'l Howe, Esq. appointed Post Master.

A Convention of the "Republican Members" of the Legislature was held in the Representatives' Hall in Portland on Friday the 15th inst., when the Hon. E. LINCOLN was nominated for re-election to the Gubernatorial chair for the next political year. We understand that Gov. L. consents to stand a candidate.

**DIALOGICAL INSTRUCTOR.** We have received the first and second numbers of a new paper of the above title published in N. York city by an association and edited by Rev. A. Wallon. It is neatly printed on a half sheet, and is issued every other Saturday at \$1 in advance. The title strikes us rather singularly, and from the principal article in the 1st No. we should think that it is as much of a *Triological* as a *Dialogical* Instructor. We bid the paper a cheerful welcome into the family of periodicals, and hope it may be eminently useful in the cause of truth and honesty.

### CONGRESSIONAL.

[From the Boston Courier.]

**WASHINGTON, Jan. 14.** On Friday last, Mr. Sloane of Ohio, offered a resolution, directing the Secretary of War to furnish the House of Representatives with a copy of the proceedings of the court-martial, which sat near Mobile on the 5th Dec. 1814, for the trial of certain Tennessee militia-men, together with sundry other papers therein named, and any information in his department, in relation to the drafted militia of that State. This morning the resolution came up for consideration, when Mr. Wickliffe moved an amendment, the purport of which was, as stated, to call on the Secretary for certain other papers, such as the muster roll, pay roll, &c. of the regiment to which the militia-men alluded to in the original resolution.

The House proceeded to the orders of the day, but had made little progress, when they were suspended, on motion of Mr. Randolph, who allowed him to propose a reference of the bills and orders of the House to a select committee for revision and amendment. By way of preface to his motion, Mr. Randolph said that when he was first a member of the House, the rules and orders were written in a small round hand and hung up in a conspic-

uous place, on a single placard. Then he was as intimately acquainted with the rules as with his alphabet; but he had grown grey in the House, and he confessed he knew nothing now of the rules and orders. He knew that they had obstructed the progress of the public business. He adverted to sundry rules, which he wished more especially to recommend to the attention of the committee, and read that which gives to the Speaker authority to admit stenographers to a place on the floor of the House. He did not wish, he said, that the Speaker should deny that courtesy to any one who reported for the press, tho' he was satisfied that the gallery was as commodious a place for a stenographer to hear as any other part of the House. He would not war against the press—he knew too well the tremendous power of that instrument—he would not prevent stenographers from publishing what the members say—but he wished them to publish what was said, without misrepresentation. He did not wish reporters to make friendships for him. He had spoken of a "learned gentleman from Louisiana," but the reporters had made him say "his honorable friend from Louisiana." Now though he was proud to act with that gentleman, and had often acted with him, yet there was no intercourse subsisting between them that merited the name of friendship. He and that gentleman had aided each other in putting down one administration, and he hoped and trusted they would co-operate in putting down another.

Mr. Sloane, from the committee on elections, to whom had been referred a memorial from sundry persons in Philadelphia, remonstrating against Mr. Sergeant's right to be sent in the House, reported a statement of facts, and a resolution that Mr. S. was entitled to a seat. Read and the resolution accepted.

**JAN. 15.** The Senate has been again occupied the greater part of the day in the consideration of executive business. There has been comparatively but little debate in that body during the present session. Col. Johnson's bill for abolishing imprisonment for debt has been almost the only topic of discussion. An importance is attached to the passage of this bill, which is altogether imaginary. Many persons, who are extremely desirous that it should become a law, do not seem to be aware that it can operate in no cases except those of debtors to the U. States; or in executions issued by the U. S. Courts; and probably not five instances would happen in a year in the whole nation, where this law could interpose between man and man, in cases subject to the operation of state laws, and of course all rhetorical flourish and patriotic declamation, in reference to its passage are inapplicable, and serve no other purpose than to accuse the speakers themselves, or to gain for them, among a certain class of people, a reputation for philanthropy and benevolence, which probably is no more due to them than to those who sit silent under the discussion, or to those who actively oppose the bill.

Mr. Ruggles, in the Senate, reported a bill for the relief of the heirs of the late General William Hull, without amendment.

**JAN. 16.** In the House, Mr. Strong, from the Committee on the Territories, which was instructed to inquire into the expediency of forming a new Territorial Government, for the country lying between the lakes Michigan and Superior, and the Mississippi river, and North of the State of Illinois, reported "a bill for establishing the Territorial Government of Huron," which was twice read, and committed to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

The Resolution calling for official information concerning the Tennessee Militia Men, some of whom were executed—was passed.

**SUPREME COURT.** The Supreme Court of the U. S. convened this morning at the capitol. Hon. Chief Justice Marshall was president, and Assistant Justices Washington, Johnson, Story, Thompson, and Trimble. On motion of Mr. Wirt, attorney-general, Sam'l A. Foot of N. Y. Daniel J. Caswell of Ohio, Edward Bates of Missouri, & Peleg Sprague of Maine, were admitted to practice as counsellors and attorneys, and were qualified by taking the usual oath. The number of cases on the docket is 134. *Ib.*

**LATEST FROM GIBRALTAR.** By the brig Amelia, Gibraltar papers to the 30th of Nov. have been received in this city. They announce the arrival of the combined squadron in safety at Malta, from Navarin.

It will be recollectcd that the Admirals of the allied fleet wrote to Ibrahim Pacha, after the battle of Navarin, threatening to destroy the remaining Turkish vessels, and demolish the fort, if a single shot was fired at any vessel or boat belonging to the Allied Powers. No direct answer was returned, but Tahir Pacha, commander of the naval forces, went on board of the Asia, and promised that there should be no further hostilities as far as his command extended, but having no control over the land forces he would make no pledge concerning them.—[New York Gaz.]

The following article will show the correct principles and impartiality which govern the Allied Admirals:

During the arduous operations in which the Combined Fleet has been engaged, the three Admirals have not, for a moment, lost sight of the outrageous conduct of the Greeks in committing piracies on the ships of all nations; after the battle they addressed a letter to the Members of the Permanent Committee of the "Corps Legislatif," of which the following is a translation:

*Port of Navarin, the 24th of October.*

Gentlemen—We learn with lively feelings of indignation, that, while the ships of the Allied Powers have destroyed the Turkish fleet which had refused submitting to an armistice *de facto*, the Greek cruisers continue to infest the seas; and that the Prize Court, the only tribunal recognized by the Greek code, seeks by legal forms to justify their excesses.

Your Provisional Government appears to think, that the Chiefs of the Allied Squadrons are not agreed on the measures to be adopted for putting a stop to this system of lawless plunder. It deceives itself. We here declare to you, with one voice, that we will not suffer your seeking, under false pretenses, to enlarge the theatre of war, that is to say, the circle of pirates.

We will not suffer any expedition, any cruise, any blockade, to be made by the Greeks beyond the limits of Volo to Le-

panto, including Salamina, Egina, Hydra and Spetza.

We will not suffer the Greeks to incite insurrection at Scio, or in Albania, thereby exposing the population to be massacred by the Turks in retaliation.

We will consider as void all Papers given to cruisers found beyond the prescribed limits; and the ships of war of the Allied Powers will have orders to arrest them, wherever they may be so found.

There remains for you no pretext. The armistice, by sea, exists, on the part of the Turks, *de facto*. Their fleet exists no more.

Take care of yours—for we will also destroy it, if need be, to put a stop to a system of robbery on the high seas, which would end in your exclusion from the law of nations.

As the present provisional government is as weak as it is immoral, we address these final and irrevocable resolutions to the legislative body.

With respect to the Prize Court which it has instituted, we declare it incompetent to judge any of our vessels without our concurrence.

We have the honor to be, Gentlemen,

Your most humble servants,

(Signed) EDWARD CODRINGTON,  
H. D. RIGBY,  
L. DE HEIDEN.

To the Members of the Permanent Committee of the Legislative Body.

Accounts from Constantinople of the 10th ult. say, the Turks had acted with great wisdom and moderation under the provocation and mortification of their unexpected and severe marine loss. No excesses appear to have been committed either at Constantinople, Smyrna, or any other place. Negotiation was still pending under the Allies' former offer of mediation.

The following are among the many reports in the English papers:—That the Ambassadors of the Allied Powers had left the capital of Turkey—that the Grand Seignor was actively preparing for war—that the Greeks had been permitted by the Allies to go on with their expedition against Scio—that Turkey had ordered the seizure of all the vessels of the Allies in Turkish ports, &c.

The official despatches received in England from Constantinople were not published at the last dates from London, (Dec. 5.)

The French National brig Paimure and Massouin were at Salonichi after the battle of Navarin; and in celebrating the fete of Charles X. gave the Turkish Flag the place of honor!

Extract of a private letter, dated

"PARIS, Dec. 1. The pure Liberal party has no other object in view than the overthrow of her Government including the dynasty as well as the Ministers, and they make no secret of their intentions. Preserving in every thing the French character, they are guided even in their political speculations by fashion; they must imitate England in every thing—they must have a second Revolution similar to that of 1688; and in order that the imitation of England may be perfect, they speculate upon placing upon the throne a Prince of Orange."

Extract of a Letter, dated Camden, Jan. 17.

"On the 15th inst. the schooner George, of Hingham, Thomas Elwell, of Northport, master, was upset in a squall, off Camden, about sunset, and almost immediately went quite bottom up; the crew consisted of the master and three men; there were two passengers on board, all of whom were lost, except a young man by the name of Elwell, who succeeded in getting on the bottom of the vessel, where he remained as he supposed until about 10 o'clock in the evening, when the vessel struck a ledge between Lassell's and Mark island—when he jumped from the wreck and with much difficulty got upon the rock, where he remained until 9 o'clock the next morning, when he was taken off by Capt. Alexander, of a schooner belonging to Beverly, badly frozen and nearly exhausted; he says the capt. might have been saved, but in attempting to relieve his brother was himself lost. A vessel from this place returning last evening with the sails and rigging of the wreck and have started this morning in the hope of saving the vessel."

In addition to the above we learn that the schooner George was owned by Capt. Joseph Woodward of Hingham, and was bound to Belfast; that the five men drowned all belonged to Northport, viz:—Thomas Elwell, master, Albion Elwell, brother to the captain, John Patterson, Tilden Thomas, and Rhoads. The wreck has been towed into Gilkey's harbor in Islesborough.

The first ledge of rocks upon which the young man, Elwell, that was saved, landed upon, he found would be entirely covered at high water, he stripped off his clothes, tied them in a bundle upon his back and swam to a larger ledge at some distance. The night was extremely cold and he was so completely chilled and benumbed that it was with much exertion he kept from falling asleep which would have been to him the sleep of death.—[Belfast Gaz.]

The allied Banks at Boston, it appears, have once more issued their manifesto, in which they state that the bills of the Bath Bank will not be received at their Banks.—The bills of this Bank are paid in specie at their counter, when presented, as those of every other Bank should be. We understand the Directors are not disposed to increase the circulation of their bills by becoming tributary to the allies in making the usual deposite demanded by the Suffolk Bank—from one to three thousand dollars.—*Me. Inq.*

**BUNKER HILL SPIRIT.** We find in the proceedings of the Senate of Massachusetts, a small spark of the fire, which glowed so ardently in the breasts of our fathers. It was emitted by the following occurrence:—Mr. Tufts, a member of that Board, and a proprietor of a large manufacturing establishment, asked leave of absence for three weeks, assigning as a reason for this long period of time, that he had been summoned by the Committee on Manufactures, in Congress, to give his evidence before that body. An animated debate immediately arose, on this motion, in which the speakers uniformly opposed the principle, that any Committee of Congress could be invested with authority to compel the attendance of any individuals, and more particularly of a legislator of any one of the States; for if, said one of them, the principle is admitted, the same committee might summon such numbers of the legislature, even the Governor himself, as to leave the

State without a competent number to transact the public business. Mr. Sturgis remarked, "that he was willing to grant the leave, as a matter of personal convenience, but would never acknowledge the right of Congress to take any member from his seat at that board; and would resist such an attempt to extremes, if necessary." After some further remarks, in which it was stated, that the question before them, did not relate to the propriety or unlawfulness of the summons for the attendance of Mr. Tufts before a Committee of Congress; but whether the Board would indulge the gentleman with leave of absence, for the time mentioned by him, the motion was put to vote, and determined in the affirmative, by the casting vote, only, of the Presiding Officer.—*Ib.*

**TAX ON NEWSPAPERS.** A motion is before Congress, for exempting newspapers and periodical works, from the burden of all postage.

We have some reason for thinking that this motion has been made at the suggestion of the Post-Master General, who must be fully satisfied with the inefficiency of the tax, as a source of revenue, to say nothing of the labour and difficulty of collection, or its unkindness in the diffusion of literature and useful intelligence.—*Ib.*

**STATE PRISON.** By the annual Report of the Warden of the State Prison, it appears that the number of Convicts on December 1, 1826, were 88—received since, 35, making in all, 123. There have been discharged since the expiration of sentence, 48—Pardon ed, 3, died 3—leaving on Dec. 1, 1827, 71.—Of the whole number discharged, 14 have returned on commitment. Of the 71 now in prison, 5 are Irish, 2 English, 2 French, 1 Scotch, 1 German, 1 Novascotian, and 1 Portuguese negro. The crimes for which they were sentenced are, larceny 45, forgery 5, counterfeiting 2, manslaughter 3, assault with intent to kill 6, assault with intent to ravish 3, adultery 6, arson 1, perjury 1. The expenses of the Institution for the year past, have been \$14,618 25, and the income \$13,179 12, leaving a balance of \$1,439 06 12 against the institution.

**SACRILEGE.** The old Synagogue in Mill Street was entered on Friday night by a gang of villains, who broke through the windows, tore open the pulpit or reading desk, forced the circular doors of the sanctuary containing the sacred rolls of the pentateuch; but not finding any thing valuable, they departed without doing further mischief. The lamp before the ark, which burns continually, afforded sufficient light to enable them to see their way. The plate belonging to the sacred rolls, which may consist of 2 or 3000 ounces, is not kept in the Synagogue, and is only brought there early on the Sabbath day. We Old Testament Jews are not so easily deprived upon as these sacrilegious rogues imagine.—[N. York Enq.]

**A COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATURE OF NORTH CAROLINA HAVE REPORTED IN FAVOR OF ENCOURAGING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF COTTON AND WOOLLEN MANUFACTORIES AND THE GROWTH OF WOOL.**

We were yesterday presented by Mr. Wm. Dart, of Waterford, with a Cabbage, raised in his garden the last season, of the Drumhead, so called, of a very large size—attached to the stump of which, we distinctly counted 27 separate heads, many of them suitable for boiling and the whole of fair size, making in all twenty-eight heads.

*N. Y. Repub.*

**WE ARE YESTERDAY PRESENTED BY MR. EBENEZER CLEAVELAND, AGED 24, SON OF THE LATE DR. C. OF BYFIELD, AND MEMBER OF BOWDOIN COLLEGE.**

In Anson Mrs. Lydia, wife of Wm. Huskell, Esq. and eldest daughter of Joseph McLellan, Esq. of Brunswick, aged 33. She was resigned and happy in her death.

In Augusta, Mr. Jeremiah Cromett, a revolutionary soldier, aged 85.

In Windsor, 31st ult. Mr. John Tinkham, aged 74. A revolutionary pensioner.

In Roxbury, Ward Nicholas Boyston, Esq. aged 78. It is said that President John Q. Adams receives no less than \$400,000 from Mr. B.'s estate.

On board the brig Noble, 6th July last, Mr. Edmund Newhall, aged 26, a passenger, son of Albert Newhall, Esq. of Portland.

In Brewer, Mrs. Botsey, consort of the Hon. Judge Perham.

**SHERIFF'S SALE, KENNEBEC, SS.** January 12th, 1828. Taken on execution and will be sold at public auction on Saturday the sixteenth day of February next at two o'clock, P. M. at the Store of Jonathan Young in Pittston.—All the right in equity which Benjamin Puicifer of Pittston has to redeem a lot of land lying in said Pittston, mortgaged and bounded as follows:—Western on Eastern River, Northerly by land of John Little and Levi Moody, Easterly by land of Leonard Cooper, Southerly by land of David Blen, containing about one hundred and thirty-six acres, with the buildings thereon.

JOSEPH YOUNG, Dep'ty Sheriff.

Several writers on Christian prophecy fix the period of the fall of the Ottoman power between 1836 and 1837—four fix upon 1844. Should they be founded in truth, we must wait some years before we witness the final dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire. It will not probably be extinguished without a long, violent and bloody struggle.

Mark Harris, Esq. has been elected State Treasurer, vice Elias Thomas, resigned.

### TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Being disappointed as to its being convenient for us to insert the communication of a "Friend to freedom of Inquiry," we have two requests to make to the writer which he will please attend to before Monday night next. We wish for the name of our correspondent, and 2d we should like to have a copy of the Morning Star sent us containing the article which is noticed by our correspondent.

"H. W." is thanked for his communication. We shall give it a place as soon as we can make it convenient.

Our friend at the east is thanked for his friendly suggestions, and informed that the Poems which he mentions have never met our eye. We should like to see a copy of them.

We are happy to hear from Br. Mace. Our readers shall also hear from him soon.

Correspondents for the paper who send their articles by mail will please direct them to the Editor at Augusta.

### MARR

## POETRY.

[For the Intelligencer &amp; Chronicle.]

The following lines are said to have been found among the papers of the late Rev. Wm. Fessenden of Walpole, N. H. By giving them an insertion you will oblige a SUBSCRIBER.

That three are one and one is three,  
Is an idea that puzzle me.  
By many a learned sage 'tis said,  
That three are one in the God-head,  
That Father, Son, and Holy Ghost  
Are three at least and one at most.

'Tis thus they would all sense confound,  
By making God a strange compound,  
Of natures two, and persons three,  
All of the same equality.

The Father then may be the Son,  
For both together make but one;  
The Son may likewise be the Father  
Without the smallest change of either;  
Yea, and the blessed Spirit be  
The Father, Son, and Trinity.

This is the creed of Christian folks,  
Who style themselves true Orthodox;  
All which, against plain common sense,  
You must believe, or give offence!

The following lines, from the Virginia Advocate, on the death of a gentleman of that State, are beautiful and touching:

THAT EYE IS DUN!  
Which seldom when on earth was doom'd to know  
But woes, that oft in highest brim  
Have bathed with tears 'till their deep fountain's  
flow,

Denied its balm to fate's last desolating blow.

THAT HAND IS STILL!  
Which knew the proud to smite, the weak to raise,  
Or, yielding inspiration's quill,  
Poured forth its bold, or mild, or melting lays,  
Or sung to Nature's God its gratitude and praise.

THAT HEAD IS LOW!  
Upon whose front was WISDOM's proud abode—  
There reason's stream, deep, clear, and slow,  
In smoothest channels, calmly, brightly flow'd;  
And inspiration's brow, with heavenly visions  
glowed.

THAT HEART IS COLD!  
Where LOVE's wild tumult, FRIENDSHIP's peaceful  
train,

And honor's impulse, reckless, bold,  
Have held their long and undisputed reign,  
Till overwhelmed at last, in DEATH's deep dark do-

## MISCELLANEOUS.

## OATHS.

Perhaps the observations about to be presented herein, on this subject, may not with many of our readers possess the charm of novelty; while to others, they may appear rather presumptuous. Nevertheless, we shall present our honest convictions on this, as we hope to do on every other speculative point. The multiplicity of oaths is not so much a grievance in this country as in many foreign nations; yet, as we are aping the fashions of Europe in all imitative things, a period of mischief and perplexity arising from this very source, may still be in store for us. It is proper then that the origin, nature, and use of oaths, should be understood and examined.

To human falsehood and perfidy, may very justly be imputed the foundation of the custom, requiring an *oath* of individuals about to perform some important legal or official duty. Until man had forfeited his character for veracity, no such ceremonial was exacted. It was then contrived by some ingenious mischief-maker, as a mode of binding the tongues of men to the utterance of truth. The most solemn and awful invocations were thought to be necessary, in order to impress upon timid or depraved minds, the danger of perjury; and the Supreme Being was blasphemously called upon to attest the sincerity of the swearer! The language of self-examination, of insult to the Deity, was employed in this extraordinary manner. The oath was sealed with a "So help me God!"—as though the eternal vengeance of heaven were invited, or despaired, upon every contemptible occasion wherein it were possible for a man to commit perjury. This custom, it is true, after some length of time, was so modified by the aristocracy of England, as to admit from the nobility, instead of a formal oath, a mere declaration *upon honour*; while the vulgar herd were still compelled to arraign themselves before the majesty of Jehovah, in every petty transaction where a lie might affect the revenue, or the purse of a neighbor, to the amount of sixpence. This distinction, we believe, is still recognised in the British Constitution, that glorious monument of the wisdom of ages!

An oath taken by a man of probity, cannot in any degree add to the weight of his testimony, nor render him more sensible of his responsibility. Indeed, such man, if he possesses any share of sensibility, must feel himself degraded by the requisition. The Court, or such other authority as may demand of him this obligation, say to him in substance—"Sir, we cannot believe your bare word—you may have been widely known through life as a man of integrity and virtue—but you must render yourself liable to the curse of God, by your own audible declarations, ere we can receive your statements, however unimportant, in the matter before us." Should his own security be endangered by his promise to render the "whole truth," another *custom* is thrust in to relieve him—he is absolved by legal subtlety, on the ground that he may not eliminate himself, from the fulfilment of affirmations which he has invoked his Maker to attest—inasmuch as he is informed by the learned jurists, that he is not bound to tell the *whole truth*, should such disclosure affect his own safety! Is not this a species of mockery, contemptuous towards the Supreme Being, and derogatory to the character and the institutions of man?

But it may be said, and indeed it has been argued, that men possessing but faint ideas of moral obligation, will be more likely, from fear of future punishment, to testify veraciously under the solemnity of an oath, than otherwise. This is a com-

mon idea, and can be supported with some plausibility. Yet, are there not reprobates in society, whose oaths are of far less value than the most trivial assertions of men, whose ordinary conduct has procured for them a fair reputation in the world? A man's moral behaviour, his faithful discharge of duties incumbent upon him in the various walks of life, should constitute the standard by which to judge of his sincerity in every emergency. Who, that knows any thing of the human mind, can expect truth from a criminal, when the gallows is inevitably to follow? And what will deter the abandoned, from adding the crime of perjury to offences already accumulated; or prevent the unprincipled, actuated by motives of malice or of interest, from enhancing his stock of diabolical gratifications by dint of falsehood? It has been estimated by an English writer, that about one million of perjuries are committed annually in the kingdom of Great Britain; so frequently are they required, and on occasions so despicable.

"If we want oaths to join us,  
Swift let us part, from pole to pole a under;  
A cause like ours is its own sacrament."

There is something not only ridiculous, but profane, in forcing an honourable man to stand up before his equals, who know him, or at least can ascertain him to be a man of worth and veracity—there to uncover his head, hold up his right hand, and utter conditional imprecations on himself in the name of Heaven, before credence can possibly be attached to a sixpenny disclosure—when, on all ordinary occasions, his simple word would be taken for thousands! And there is something preposterous in the expectation of dragging truth from a notorious liar, through the mere dread of retribution hereafter—when such a man's life has, most probably, been a continued scene of iniquity, wherein the laws of God and man have been equally set at defiance. It is punishment here that such villains apprehend—the chastisement which human laws have ordained in such cases, rather than Almighty vengeance in a world to come; and this chastisement may as well be awarded, without foisting into the formality of an oath, the insulted name of Deity.—[Bost. Eve. Bulletin.]

## PROGRESS OF TIME.

A year has just terminated, and a year has just commenced. Days and seasons have rolled away, and days and seasons are rolling on. Time passes over beauty, and it withers; over strength, and it fails; over pleasure, and it sickens; over wealth, and it vanishes. Time is the world's book-keeper, and a faithful recorder he is. In turning over a few leaves of the volume he has just closed, we find many interesting and appalling events spoken of. He blots out no crime, he neglects no virtue. The changes put down in his book are not confined merely to the things around us. No, no—they extend even to man's very heart. We read of power crushed to impotence, and of humility rising from its lowly bed to the high summit of fame; of temples and palaces losing their splendor, and mingling at last together in one common ruin; of pestilence sweeping along with destructive fury in one place, and in others of health waited on every breeze. We read now of clashing nations and clashing individuals, "tugging at each other's hearts;" and now of peace beaming forth its mellow light, diffusing among men a mutual feeling of kindred and love. We read of fortunes blasted, and of poverty relieved; of the good who have struggled with adversity, and of the bad who have revelled in wealth. We read of hard-toiling ambition and ingenious enterprise—now successful, now disappointed. We read of pride, stripped of its trappings; of vice forsaking its way, and virtue sliding from her path into the deep black waters of temptation; and on the other hand, of vice increasing in its guilt, and virtue expanding in her loveliness. We read of folly ashamed of its excesses, and vanity blushing at its insignificance; of friendship violated, of truth reviled, and of perfidy and treachery laying waste the principles of honesty and justice. We read of the stubborn and avicious, who for a paltry claim deprive the honest, industrious and unfortunate, of their last and best comfort. We read often, of a rich man in his misery, and a poor man in his happiness; and of those, too, who have no solace but their hopes, nor any bounty but their tears. We read of genius now going straight forward to a glorious consummation, and now struggling in its helplessness; of the oppressed, victorious over the oppressor; and of the obscure coming out of their hiding-places, to shine as living monuments of worth amidst popularity and praise. The paths of pleasure, too, are pointed out, and so are the thorns, and the rough places, and the rocks. Health and disease, sweet and bitter potions, mingle in every scene, tiring men of their pursuits, rendering hopeless their plans, and tasteless their enjoyments. We read of untouched hearts, and hearts pained by sorrow, and hearts broken by grief. We read also of happiness taking a wide flight, and entering the abodes sometimes of mirth, and the halls of the great, but oftener the "lowly thatched cottage" of the laboring swain. We read of the obdurate who have become lenient; of the cheerful who have become sad; of the morose becoming affable; of the thoughtless, learning discretion; of the forbidding and austere, becoming open and frank; of the slanderer wounded by his own weapons; and of deceivers weeping at the mischief of their

own vile practices. We read of public and private charity, blessing and adorning the houseless, and bearing comfort to the friendless; of fair and prosperous countries; of intelligence pursuing its march with unchecked progress; of institutions pouring forth the light of knowledge and religion, to guide and cheer mortal man; and of ignorance and vice vanishing before the rays of science like mist before the sun. The changes of time are written on the furrowed brow of age; on the care-worn cheek; and every sigh speaks of them, and every tear confirms them, and every pang impresses them still deeper into the heart. So does time mend the ravages he makes. To the frame which has been shaken by disease, he often gives new vigor and new strength; to the afflicted, some gracious consolation; and when having crossed us in our plans, he is still good enough to gild the horizon of the soul with the beams of a new-born hope. He may now and then deprive us of some favorite pleasure, but he will give in return an ample equivalent; he may dart an arrow into the breast, but he will pour into the wound a healing balsam; he may open the grave for one we love, and carry us to its side, and show its darkness and dreariness, but he will point to the world beyond, and raise up another who shall be as valued and dear.

This great division of time, taking place at this inclement season, should teach us to be charitable; inasmuch as we are emphatically told by it of our infirmity, our fleetingness, and our dependence on each other. When the cold and sleet are driving furiously through the air, many a fellow creature is shrinking from the bitter blast, as it flies through the crevices of his shattered tenement, writhing under the lash of poverty and the lash of the tempest, with no food to sustain life but what he begs, or finds by accident—no pillow for his head—nothing but a few almost useless rags to cover him—and scarce an ember on the hearth to warm his freezing blood,—and his only music is the plaintive cries of his children and his wife, mingled with the wild phrenzy of the howling storm. Now, if ever, should the hand of Charity be wide open and full.

We are sailing fast down the stream of time, and it will bear us all, the rich and the poor, the happy and the miserable, speedily along to the close of our existence.—[Masonic Mirror.]

Governors of the several States—and the Population in 1820.

Maine, Enoch Lincoln,	293,355
New Hampshire, Benj. Pierce,	244,161
Massachusetts, Levi Lincoln,	523,237
Rhode Island, James Fenner,	83,058
Connecticut, Gideon Tomlinson,	275,243
Vermont, Ezra Butler,	235,764
New York, De Witt Clinton,	1,372,812
New Jersey, Isaac H. Williamson,	277,575
Pennsylvania, John A. Shultz,	1,049,458
Delaware, Charles Polk,	72,749
Maryland, Joseph Kent,	407,350
Virginia, William B. Giles,	1,065,36
N. Carolina, James Iredell,	638,829
S. Carolina, John Taylor,	502,741
Georgia, John Forsyth,	340,989
Alabama, John Murphy,	127,901
Mississippi, Gerard C. Brandon,	75,448
Louisiana, Henry Johnson,	153,407
Tennessee, Samuel Huston,	422,613
Kentucky, Joseph Desha,	564,317
Ohio, Alen Trimble,	581,434
Indiana, James B. Ray,	147,178
Illinois, Ninian Edwards,	55,211
Missouri, John Miller,	66,586
Michigan Territory, Lewis Cass,	8,896
Arkansas, do., George Izard,	14,246
District Columbia,	33,039
Total,	9,637,999
Number of free white males, 3,995,053	
—females, 3,866,657. Total, 7,861,710	
tree white citizens.	

UNITED STATES' CALENDAR.

Presidents.

1739 George Washington, born 11th February, 1732; died 14th Dec. 1799, aged 68.
1797 John Adams, born 19th Oct. 1735; died 4th July, 1826, aged 91.
1801 Thomas Jefferson, born 2d April, 1743; died 4th July, 1826, aged 83.
1809 James Madison, born 5th March, 1751.
1817 James Monroe, born 2d April, 1759.
1825 John Quincy Adams, born 11th July, 1767.

VICE PRESIDENTS.

1789, John Adams; 1797, Thos. Jefferson; 1801, Aaron Burr; 1805, George Clinton; 1810, Elbridge Gerry; 1817, Daniel D. Tompkins; 1825, John C. Calhoun.
SECRETARIES OF STATE.
1789, Thos. Jefferson; 1794, Edmund Randolph; 1795, Timothy Pickering; 1800, James M'Henry; 1800, Samuel Dexter; 1801, Henry Dearborn; 1809, Wm. Eustis; 1814, John Armstrong; 1816, Wm. H. Crawford; 1818, John C. Calhoun; 1825, James Barbour.
SECRETARIES OF WAR.
1789, Henry Knox; 1795, Timothy Pickering; 1799, Oliver Wolcott; 1801, Samuel Dexter; 1801, Albert Gallatin; 1815, George W. Campbell; 1816, Alexander J. Dallas; 1817, Wm. H. Crawford; 1825, Richard Rush.
SECRETARIES OF THE TREASURY.
1789, Alexander Hamilton; 1795, Oliver Wolcott; 1801, Samuel Dexter; 1801, Albert Gallatin; 1815, George W. Campbell; 1816, Alexander J. Dallas; 1817, Wm. H. Crawford; 1825, Richard Rush.
SECRETARIES OF THE NAVY.
1789, Paul Hamilton; 1814, Wm. Jones; 1816, B. W. Crowninshield; 1818, Smith Thompson; 1825, Samuel L. Southard.

CHEAP ROOM PAPERS.

A NEW supply of low priced Room Papers, just received and for sale at the GARDINER BOOKSTORE.

JUST published by DORR & HOWLAND of Worcester, and for sale by GLAZIER & CO. Hallowell, and P. SHELDON, Gardiner, the 3d edition of the

COLUMBIAN CLASS-BOOK; consisting of Geographical, Historical and Biographical Extracts, compiled from authentic sources, and arranged on a plan different from any thing before offered to the public. Particularly designed for the use of schools. By A. T. Lowe, M. D.

CONTENTS.

Biographical sketches of Washington; The river Ganges; Ancient Pompeii; Of Egypt; Sect. 2. Of the dress of the Egyptians, &c. do. 3. of their government, &c. do. 4. of their diversions, &c. do. 5. of their religion, &c. do. 6. of the climate of Africa, the Nile, and the pyramids of Egypt; Character and manners of the Indians west of the Mississippi; Sect. 2, the Indian canoe, do. 3, Indian mode of taking the Buffalo, do. 4, Specimens of Indian eloquence; Speech of Logan to Lord Dunmore, governor of Virginia; Speech of Cornplan to General Washington; Extract from a Sachem's Speech to his people, &c.; Speech of an Indian Chief to General Knox; Generosity and tenderness of an Indian Chief; The Corsair; Biographical sketch of Franklin; Lake Asaphites; Siege and destruction of Tyre; Biographical sketch of Newton; Of Guinea; The winter evening; Biographical sketch of Johnson; Death of Socrates; Of Holland; Sect. 1, Of the Persons of the Hollander, do. 2, Of their houses, &c. do. 3, Of their mode of travelling, &c.; Do. 4. Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Hague, &c.; Battle of the Nile; Death of Archimedes; Description of a thunder storm; Grand divisions of the earth, Sect. 1, Europe, do. 2, Asia, do. 3, Africa, do. 4, America, do. 5, New-Holland; Destruction of Carthage; Capture of Quebec; Volcanic mountains, do. 4, Hecia; Leonidas' address to his countrymen; do. 4, Answer to the Persian Ambassador; do. Pathetic farewell to his wife and family; Fort William Henry; Massacre at Fort William Henry; Gibraltar; Biographical sketch of Demosthenes; Of New Zealand, Sect. 2, Of their dress, do. 3, Of their dance, music, &c. do. 4, Of the treatment of their enemies, do. 5, Of their religion and conduct towards their dead; Lapland; Destruction of Rome by the Gauls; Temple of Fame; Great Wall of China; Great African Desert; Expedition of Burgoine; Russia; Lydia; The river Amazon; Destruction of Jerusalem; Of Otaheite; Extract from the Episode of Nisus and Euryalus; Brief sketch of the American revolution; Biographical sketch of Cicero; Hymn to the Sun; Description of the White Hills in New-Hampshire; Terra del Fuego; Anecdotes of Alexander the Great; The Cobbler; Battle of Pharsalia and death of Pompey; Biographical sketch of Hannibal; Embassy of the Supreme Being; Of Mines, Sect. 1, Diamond mines, do. 2, Gold and Silver mines, do. 3, Quicksilver mines, do. 4, Iron mines, do. 5, Tin, Copper and Lead mines, do. 6, Coal mines, do. 7, Felling Colliery; The Last Day; Mountains; Rives and Cataracts; The Ocean; Conclusion, containing a brief view of the Universe.

RECOMMENDATION

From the Rev. Leonard Woods, D. D. of the Theological Seminary, Andover.

"Dear Sirs, I have attentively examined the Columbian Class-Book, and am well satisfied that the plan is judicious and well executed, and that a school book, containing such a variety of useful information exhibited in so interesting a form, will be an addition to the advantages already enjoyed by American youth. Should you proceed to publish the book, as I hope you will, I should have no doubt of its gaining, in due time, an extensive patronage among the Instructors and friends of the rising generation.